UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT -DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Bienvenido I. Lugo Marchant Plaintiff

V.

Peter Tsickritzis, Kevin Kingston, United Liquors Limited et 0 5 11317 NMC
Defendants

Referred to my John John

COMPLAINT **Parties**

- 1. The plaintiff is a resident of 19 Grove Street, Brockton, Plymouth County, Massachusetts and a citizen of the United States of America.
- 2. The defendants are Peter Tsickritzis (Director of Operations), Kevin Kingston (Warehouse Manager) of United Liquors Limited and United Liquors Limited. United Liquors Limited ("ULL", "the company") is located on 175 Campanelli Drive, Braintree Massachusetts and has more than 100 employees.

JUSRISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 USC. Section 1332

FACTS

1. ULL sponsors a Commercial Driving License ("CDL") training for its workers, who upon successful completion are promoted to the seniority list. ULL supported the plaintiff in one occasion; not many times, as they affirmed at the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination ("MCAD"). After obtaining his CDL, the plaintiff was demoted to a warehouse position where he was required to operate industrial equipment he was not trained to operate and asked to put trucks in an adjacent lot for new drivers who would be promoted after being trained. The plaintiff was given no indication of being considered for a promotion or to upgrade his CDL B to CDL A.

- 2. After working in a new territory, refused by more than 50 experienced drivers, the plaintiff returned to the warehouse of ULL whereby Mr. Kingston berated him in front of office personnel while demanding from him "not to talk like that". The defendant did not explain if he was referring to the plaintiff's speech impairment or national origin accent. The plaintiff asked Mr. Tsickritzis, Mr. Kingston's supervisor, to explain and correct his subordinate. Mr. Tsickritzis did not correct anything but supporting his subordinate referred the plaintiff to Mr. Kingston who told the plaintiff "you'll stay at the warehouse (earning less)"
- 3. On March 12, 2003 the plaintiff submitted a written petition to Mr. Kingston whereby he asked for a religious accommodation in order to continue working at ULL and practicing his faith. Mr. Kingston refused to sign the letter prompting the plaintiff to stamp it with the time clock used to indicate a working shift. Mr. Kingston asked the plaintiff if he wanted "to get fired to practice his beliefs". During the next months, Mr. Kingston asked through supervisors and coworkers if the plaintiff was "leaving earlier to go and pray". When the plaintiff asked Mr. Kingston if this treatment was racially motivated he denied it claiming there was one colored driver and that "one was enough", thus establishing a racial quota. Another Black co-worker who was given a religious accommodation was terminated from work after being put to work in an isolated area. Other White workers who proclaimed their faiths were not ridiculed. Previously, the plaintiff asked for leaves, without saying they were faith related, and they were granted.
- 4. Several weeks after having an accident at work (June 17, 2003), the plaintiff called Linley Bigney (ULL's personnel office) to comment about his health after an accident at work, and desire to work as before. Ms. Bigney recommended the plaintiff to "drop the claim at MCAD to get on the seniority list". The MCAD informed the plaintiff about the consequences of withdrawing a claim after it being under investigation. Later on, Ms. Bigney told the plaintiff she was "put a gag (on the plaintiff)" after not being successful.

- 5. On August 18, 2003, ULL submitted a document through its legal representatives to the MCAD stating the plaintiff was already collecting workers compensation. The plaintiff was neither demanding nor receiving compensation. That became true many months later. At the same time, ULL refused to give the plaintiff lightduty work or medical treatment as was the case with other White workers injured at work. The plaintiff had to seek medical treatments from other sources since his medical coverage was cancelled (August 29, 2003) after the first hearing at the MCAD.
- 6. On August 26, 2003 ULL suggested the plaintiff through its receptionist to "work in the warehouse doing maintenance, there are more Spanish people over there" when he asked if ULL had openings for salespersons. The receptionist joked about the plaintiff's national origin with co-workers at the lobby asking them "do you think Spanish people need to speak English to work in the warehouse?" and suggested him to "get an application for Spanish people from Laura's office". This continued until Mr. Tsickritzis came to the lobby with an unidentified intimidating man. The defendant berated the plaintiff and asked him to leave while mocking about the plaintiff applying for a job as a salesperson since he had a claim against ULL. The defendant told the plaintiff he was not fired, though. These actions were witnessed by other people.
- 7. On or about January 2004, the defendant invited the plaintiff to have a meeting at ULL with the Human Resources Vice-President, Kathleen Mansfield, whereby he was asked about his health and offered an unacceptable shift. A union representative witnessed this meeting as the plaintiff requested so.
- 8. The plaintiff has supportive declarations from a co-worker who was given corporate goods and favors in exchange for information about the plaintiff and others. Ms. Mansfield and other Vice Presidents were present at these conferences. Later on, ULL allegedly terminated him from work allegedly because of drinking on the job.

The plaintiff believes ULL violated at least on two occasions the Title VII of the CRA of 1964 while promoting new workers to the seniority list (after working a few weeks) and later another group of new workers (all Whites) with no experience on ULL while the plaintiff had more than four years working for ULL. The plaintiff believes ULL should relieve him with \$1,000,000 for these acts. The plaintiff believes ULL acted maliciously when mocking and demoting the plaintiff after he asked the defendants to explain or correct their comments on speech impairment or national origin accent according the Title I of the ADA 1990 and the Title VII of the CRA of 1991. The plaintiff believes ULL should relieve him with \$2,000,000. The plaintiff believes ULL should relieve him with \$2,000,000 for their changing the truth about training opportunities, workers compensation, libel, slander, denying medical treatment and light work accommodation, falsifying information to the Massachusetts Division of Unemployment Assistance, creating a hostile work environment, racial and religious harassment. The plaintiff should see a relief of no less than \$65,000 and benefits for every year he has not worked after obtaining his CDL and return to his normal job. The plaintiff seeks a positive letter of recommendation from ULL and their supervisors and employees to take an orientation on diversity and civil rights.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff demands judgment against the defendants for damages and such other relief as this Court deems just.

The plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

Bienvenido I. Lugo Marchant 19 Grove Street Brockton, MA 02301 508-587-1018

Beligible

SJS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

ATTACHMENT 2

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained merein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

l. (a) PLAINTIFFS	3 ironsonde has	. Manha t			Peter T	ANT	S (AE)	, Kevin Kin	ny, tan , Un	ted L	ازسهم
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.							
	e, Address, and Telephone N		ت i	C	Attorneys (If	f Know	1	317	NM	G	
	T BRECKTON	<u> </u>			(5 C/m	Penny	$u \nu$				
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	n One Box Only)			Sity Cases On		INCI DE	PAL PARTIES Ef	(Place an "X" in Or and One Box		
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Governm	ent Not a Party)		Citizen of	This State			l Incorporated or of Business I	r Principal Place In This State	□ 4	□ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citize in Item III)	enship of Parties			Another State				In Another State	□ 5	D 5
					Subject of a Country		3 []	3 Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in On	ne Box Only)									
CONTRACT		RTS		FORFEIT	JRE/PENALT	Y	В	ANKRUPTCY	OTHER S	TATUT	ES
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights	PERSONAL INJUI 362 Personal Injury— Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury— Product Liability 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 700 Truth in Lending 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Ot 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	RTY RTY NS	625 Dn of 630 Li 640 R. 650 Ai 660 Oc 53 690 Ot 710 Fa Ac 720 La 720 La 740 Ra 740 Ra 790 Ot 791 En 791 En	her Food & Dru ug Related Seiz Property 21 USc	rds (PRC 820 830 840 840 SOC 861 862 863 864 865 FEDI	Appeal 28 USC 158 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PERTY RIGHTS Copyrights Patent Trademark CIAL SECURITY HIA (1395ff) Black Lung (923) DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) SSID Title XVI RSI (405(g)) ERAL TAX SUITS Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	☐ 810 Selective ☐ 850 Securities Exchange ☐ 875 Customer 12 USC 3 ☐ 891 Agricultu ☐ 892 Economic	d Banking e/ICC Ra on Influence organizatic Service //Commod Challeng 410 ral Acts e Stabiliza ental Mat Illocation / of on Act Fee Under ess to Jus onality of tutes	ed and ons ditties/ ge attion Act tters Act
		(PLACE AN Remanded from E Appellate Court] 4	N ONE BO Reinstate or Reopeneo	d ☐ 5 T		rred from		strict	ppeal to dge fron agistrate dgment	n E
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Do not cite jurisdictiona	te under which you are fili Il statutes unless diversity.)				se.		OHEOV VES			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.	S IS A CLASS ACTION	DN 	DEMAN	 AD 2			CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND		omplain No	nc:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE						CKET MBER			
NATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORN	EY OF REC	CORD						
OR OFFICE USE ONLY											
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP			JUDG	E		MAG. JUE	OGE		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1	TITLE O	F CASE	NAME OF FIRST PARTY ON EACH SIDE ONL	n Bienter	C. line	7C	ATTACH	MENT 3		
•		The Us FIDE								
2.			/HICH THE CASE BELONGS BASED UPON TH	IE NUMBERED I	NATURE (OF SUIT CO	DE LISTED ON T	HE CIVIL		
		l.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NAT	URE OF SUIT	A COLO					
	_	H.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 6 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 850, 890, 89				te AO 120 or AO ⁻ ademark or copyi			
	_	101.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 3 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 3 380, 385, 450, 891.							
		IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.		•	4 0				
		٧.	150, 152, 153.	05	1	13	17 N	IMC		
3.	TITLE A HAS BE	ND NUMI EN FILEC	BER, IF ANY, OF RELATED CASES. (SEE LO D IN THIS DISTRICT PLEASE INDICATE THE 1	CAL RULE 40.1(I	G)). IF MO BER OF T	ORE THAN (HE FIRST F	ONE PRIOR RELA ILED CASE IN TH	ATED CASE HS COURT.		
4.	HAS A F		CTION BETWEEN THE SAME PARTIES AND B	ASED ON THE S	AME CLA	IM EVER B	EEN FILED IN TH	ıs		
				YE	es 🗆	NO	A			
5.			PLAINT IN THIS CASE QUESTION THE CONS 3T? (SEE 28 USC §2403)	TITUTIONALITY	OF AN AC	T OF CON	RESS AFFECTIN	IG THE		
			(YE	es 🗆	NO	Z			
	IF SO, 1	S THE U.S	S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE	OF THE U.S. A	PARTY?					
				YE	ES Li	МО	Д			
6.	IS THIS 28 USC		EQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED E	BY A DISTRICT C	OURT OF	THREE JU	DGES PURSUAN	T TO TITLE		
				YE	es 🗆	NO				
7.	COMMO	NWEALT	PARTIES IN THIS ACTION, EXCLUDING GOV I'H OF MASSACHUSETTS ("GOVERNMENTAL ? - (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(D)).							
				YE	s D	, NO				
		A.	IF YES, IN WHICH DIVISION DO ALL OF TH	E NON-GOVERN	MENTAL	PARTIES R	ESIDE?			
			EASTERN DIVISION CENT	TRAL DIVISION		WES	STERN DIVISION			
		В.	IF NO, IN WHICH DIVISION DO THE MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES, RESIDING I				LY PARTIES, EX	CLUDING		
(PL	EASE TY	PE OR P		TRAL DIVISION		WES	STERN DIVISION			
•		S NAME								
ΑD	DRESS _	<u> 14 (</u>	grove St. Broditon MA, 02341							
TE	EPHON!	E NO	(405) 581-1018							
(Aff	3Cover s	sheet loca	al.wpd - 11/27/00)							